Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/601,374	HAARER ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
LaToya I. Cross	1743

Interview Summary	1 00,000,000	/ // VII CEIVE / / CEI		
interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	LaToya I. Cross	1743		
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):				
(1) <u>LaToya I. Cross</u> .	(3)			
(2) <u>Christopher Mitchell</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>18 June 2003</u> .				
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☑ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2	2)⊠ applicant's representative)]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.			
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1 and 19</u> .				
Identification of prior art discussed: Kanakkanatt.				
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□ N/A.				
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .				
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)				
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.				

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Application No. 09/601,374

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Att. Mitchell submitted proposed amendments noting that the product was a crystalline material and further noting that the discoloration proceeds continuously following photo-induced coloration indicate a history of temperature exposure over time. Since crystalline materials are not taught by Kanakkanatt and the continuous discoloration is not taught with respect to photochromic materials, the Kanakkanatt rejection will be overcome with the amendment. The amendment will be formally filed..